REMARKS

OF

DR. J. R. BURDEN, OF PHILADELPHIA CO.

IN THE SENATE OF PENNSYLVANIA,

ON THE

ABOLITION QUESTION,

FEBRUARY, 1838.

ALSO HIS

VALEDICTORY ADDRESS

AS SPEAKER OF THE SENATE,

APRIL, 1838.

PRINTED BY ORDER OF THE DEMOCRATIC ASSOCIATION OF PENNSYLVANIA.

PHILADELPHIA:

1838

Dr. Jeffery R. Brackett
June 20, 1917

REMARKS OF MR. BURDEN,

MADE IN THE SENATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, ON THE RESOLUTION RELATIVE TO THE RIGHT OF PETITION.

Dr. BURDEN said—

When this subject was originated, it was to him a cause of regret.—The question, stripped of its covering, and presented in its real colour, is that of abolition. At the last session, the Governor, in his message, had called the attention of the Legislature to the subject of domestic slavery; at this session he had wisely avoided it; he (Mr. B.) was therefore surprised at its introduction to the Senate. But from the course the debate had taken, he now rather rejoiced that it had been introduced; there was a responsibility attached to it which he thought the Senate was able to meet, and he knew of no place more proper, and of no time fitter for the discussion. We have been warned of "a day of retribution;" have been told that political preferment would, 'ere long, depend on our opinions and votes on the question of abolition; that the "monster party" would be invoked, and be inseparably attached to it. He listened to such prophecies without fear; they would be met without flinching.

He had followed invariably one rule in relation to party. He had obeyed its mandates so long as they were consistent with the interests and welfare of the country, and no longer. He did not hesitate a moment to sacrifice party clamor to public opinion, or to scatter party to the winds when country was at stake. He had been put to the trial on several occasions, and the journals would show his course.

As a member of the Jackson party, neither political friends nor political foes, had ever doubted his zeal. Whilst a member of that party he had been called upon in the Senate to vote in approbation of President Jackson's veto of the Maysville road bill. That veto deprived Pennsylvania of the unobstructed navigation of the Delaware and Chesapeake canal, and settled a principle which would deprive her of the advantages of national roads, leading to or through her territory. He stood by the interests of the State—voted to disapprove of that veto.

President Jackson in his message to Congress urged the destruction of the tariff; he (Mr. B.) offered resolutions in favor of the tariff, which were agreed to by the Legislature. The interests of party required an acquiescence in the measure proposed by the President; the interests of Pennsylvania at that time required that the tariff should be sustained; the existence of her manufactures, the welfare of her citizens demanded it. He did not pause to declare which he preferred.

The President avowed hostility to internal improvement; he (Mr. B.) introduced resolutions which were passed by the Legislature in favor of internal improvement. He knew that the interests of the State required appropriations from Congress to the Cumberland road, and he was anxious to have a national road from Lake Erie to Baltimore.

The President in his message recommended the annihilation of the United States Bank. He (Mr. B.) offered resolutions approving of a renewal of its charter. Mr. Charles J. Ingersoll then a member of the House of Representatives, who is now called a "first rate democrat," had offered a resolution in favor of a Bank which he could not succeed in getting passed in that House. His (Mr. Burden's) resolutions passed by an unanimous vote of the Senate, and by upwards of three-fourths of the vote of the House. He thought, at the time, that the continuance of the Bank was necessary for the country; and did not shrink from openly advocating the interests of the people at the hazard of party opposition.

When the Union was in jeopardy, and compromise was required to preserve it, he had not faltered; but, on the resolutions offered by Mr. Petrikin, had ardently urged a sacrifice of local interests and party views, to the great interests of the nation, and of the Union.

On one of those occasions he had given his views of party. It was then he announced that no party in this country could stand against the interests of the people, and that any party inimical to those interests, *must die, will die, ought to die.* Such were his opinions of duty to party.

A question now is presented, the main features of which involve danger to the country, and party is invoked to determine the result. He who would be deterred from doing his duty on such an occasion, might, from the momentary excitement of the people, be elected to a higher seat, but he could not be elevated; station could do him no honor; his laurels would be faded—himself an object of contempt; he might gain the applause of party, but he would carry with him a consciousness that he was degraded and unworthy. Let popular clamour consign the patriot to a private station, he will find it the post of honor. He may, rather than sacrifice the interests of the country, aid in destroying the Union, and

with it the liberties of the people—fall the victim of party. If he has the nobility of nature in his composition, he will be willing to abide by the award; he will glory in the thought that his downfall has tended to preserve his country.

Party! What has party to do in a question like this? Whether this or that administration of the government shall be sustained or put down, is a fleeting question. We may have our preferences for this or that candidate for the Presidency, or for his measures; we may urge our preference with all the zeal of enthusiasm; but how trifling in importance, how short lived in duration when we put in comparison the preservation of the Union—the palladium of our liberties!

We are urged to show our manhood to the south in order to prove that we are not the "doe faces," which Mr. Randolph once called the people of the north. We are called upon to do wrong because we are dared to do it. This is not the course for reflecting men to adopt. He had heard of a boy who gave as his reason for jumping into a water ditch, that he was not the boy to be dared; but he thought that such incentives ought not to rise higher than childhood—they do not become men. Fear ought not to deter us from doing right, nor daring make us do wrong.

Much censure had, in the course of the discussion, been cast upon the south; it had been said, that whenever the north was called upon to sacrifice its interests, the threat of disunion had been made, and that the north had succumbed. He thought, however, that, respecting threats of nullification, the language of an amusement, (which he did not participate in,) would well apply, that between the north and the south, "honors were easy;" he, at least, was willing so to count this family game.

He would remind the senator from Allegheny, of the nullification in Pennsylvania, called the whiskey insurrection—he would recommend him to read a book in the library titled Olmstead's Case. He (Mr. B.) recollected, having seen, when a boy, the state troops at Fort Rittenhouse, corner of Arch and Seventh streets, in Philadelphia, by order of the Governor of this Commonwealth, resisting and nullifying the laws of the United States. He would also call his attention to Shay's insurrection in Massachusetts.

The south had threatened nullification; it was, however, in a time of profound peace. The north had threatened it, when our frontier bristled with thousands of foreign bayonets, when our government was so paralized, that orders were given to run our frigates under the protection of our harbor cannon, to protect them from capture. It was then that our STEWART and BAINBRIDGE begged the department to let them meet the

enemy; their prayer was granted: the noble daring of our seamen sustained the honor of our flag; and the stripes and stars were triumphant. Let *us* not talk of southern threats; let us agree throughout the Union to bury the remembrance of our follies.

The course of England has been referred to on the subject of slavery. Humanity never interferred with the policy of that government; her course has been marked by calculations of sordid interest. Her cruelties to the people of India are well known; her oppression of the noble people of Ireland is more bitter than the worst slavery of the blacks in our southern states. England established slavery in this country when we were colonies; she turned a deaf ear to the urgent prayers of the provinces of the South when they implored her to abolish the slave trade. She told the assembly of Carolina in so many words that it was the interest of the mother country to continue the trade in human flesh. She sustained that trade until, having lost most of her sugar colonies in the West Indies, she thought it policy to destroy the sugar trade of the French. She then began to preach humanity and philanthropy; she preached this louder when she thought it would aid her in what she called the "right of search;" that was to search vessels to ascertain whether they were engaged in the slave trade, the easier to impress American seamen. Such tender mercies are cruel.

Our fathers when they declared independence in 1776, could not abolish domestic slavery—it had been introduced *by the mother country.* When they declared that all men were free and equal, they did not use the declaration in its unlimited sense—they knew that men were unequal in many respects. Had they intended it in the sense which some in our day have endeavored to attach to it, domestic slavery would have ceased so far as it was in their power to have abolished it; they, however used the phrase, aware of the existence of domestic slavery, and with no intention of eradicating it.

When the men of the revolution "in order to form a more perfect Union, established justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty," established the constitution of the United States in the year 1787, they had to consider, with deep interest, the subject of domestic slavery. A Union of sovereign states which should "secure all rights of independent sovereignty to each, and yet provide for the interest and safety of all," was no easy task. The difficulties were increased by the particular interest of the slave holding states, and occurred in deciding upon one of the peculiarities of our government, the principle of representation. One branch of the government was constituted by giving each

state two Senators, without respect to the size or population of the state.

For the House of Representatives, members were apportioned among the several states according to their respective numbers. In fixing this basis the South contended that their slaves should be considered as *persons*. The North would not consider them as persons, but solely as *property*. The matter was, however, compromised by considering them three-fifths as persons and two-fifths as property.

The constitution not only sanctioned slavery but provided that the slave trade should be protected until the year 1808.

General Washington the President of the Convention in his letter to Congress says:

"It is at all times difficult to draw with precision the line between those rights which must be surrendered and those which may be reserved; and on the present occasion this difficulty was increased by a difference among the several states as to their situation, extent, habits and particular interests.

"In all our deliberations on this subject we kept steadily in our view that which appears to us the greatest interest of every true American, *the consolidation of our Union, in which is involved our prosperity, felicity, safety—perhaps our national existence.* This important consideration, seriously and deeply impressed on our minds, led each state in the convention to be less rigid on points of inferior magnitude than might have been otherwise expected; and thus the constitution which we now present, is the result of a spirit of amity, and of that mutual deference and concession which the peculiarity of our political situation rendered indispensable.

That it will meet the full and entire approbation of every state, is not perhaps to be expected, but each will doubtless consider that had her interest alone been consulted, the consequences might have been particularly disagreeable or injurious to others."

The Union could not have been formed, the constitution could not have been framed, without the recognition of domestic slavery. Our fathers had to choose between *union with domestic slavery—and disunion with domestic slavery;* for refusing to unite would not have abolished this institution. That union, in the opinion of George Washington, involved "our prosperity, felicity, safety—perhaps our national existence." Than him, no man ever lived better able to judge of what is right and proper, more entitled to the respect and homage of the world. Pure in his private character, spotless in his patriotism, cautious in forming opinions, firm in maintaining them—no age has produced his parallel. God never made

such another man. He was not alone in the belief that our Union and liberties were indissolubly connected—the sages of the revolution thought with him. The framers of the constitution were not every day men; they had risked their lives and fortunes, and pledged their honor for their country in a long and dreadful struggle. They had no monster party to bow to, for party had not then arisen to assume the garb of patriotism.—They knew and felt what liberty and freedom meant; they understood what were the rights of man; they permitted what they could not prevent, the continuance of domestic slavery. Who will charge *them* with want of philanthropy? Look at their lives, judge them by their actions, examine the constitution which they framed, calculate its effects on this country, compare its results with the history of any government for the same time, and let the world decide whether any other age has produced their equals. Their wisdom, patriotism, integrity, philanthropy, and if you will have it, *their christianity* was quite as great as that which the anti-slavery men claim.

The language of Jefferson has been quoted against this institution. He wrote that when he thought of slavery: he trembled to think there was a God of justice; yet when he writes to Peter Carr, he tells him that if he should be led to disbelieve in the existence of a God he will find sufficient incentives to virtue and morality without it. So much for his opinion. If he thought slavery such an evil why did he not free his slaves? A man might as well claim repentance to God whilst he injures his fellow man, as a slaveholder to exclaim against the wickedness of slavery. Mr. Madison's opinion is entitled to no more weight on this subject than Mr. Jefferson's, for he retained his slaves.

Thomas Paine was among the earliest advocates of abolition in this country and across the Atlantic. With him philanthropy was a passion—his heart overflowed with kindness to the human race. His theories on most subjects were too fanciful for practice; and, in politics and benevolence, his views were too visionary, in many instances, to meet with the assent of the cool and reflecting.

Mr. B. said he had understood that the members of the abolition society, those who had engaged at an early period of our history in this cause, did not wish to be identified with the *anti-slavery* men of later years.—The abolition society appears to have been instituted in Pennsylvania, not for the purpose of interfering with the rights of other states, but for the purpose of ameliorating the condition of the colored people in our own state, and of protecting them in their rights. He did not doubt that one of their objects was the gradual abolition of slavery, in such manner as

should not invade rights guaranteed by the Constitution. Their means were persuasion and reason, not crusade.

He said that as humanity had been appealed to and had been identified with the cause of *anti-slavery*, he would make a few observations on that point. He would not speak of the feeling which actuated the advocates of anti-slavery, for he had no doubt it was honest, altho' misguided; he would however examine the results, and endeavour to show the practical consequences. The abstract he would not interfere with; the reality he would scrutinize.

What has resulted from the agitation of the question of slavery?

Before the cause was taken up with so much zeal, the colored people in Pennsylvania were gradually elevating their standard of character. They had among them men who merited and received the regard and respect of the community. Among these he would name James Forten, of Philadelphia. This man had served with honor in the revolution: in all the relations of life his reputation has been spotless. Such men had exercised an immense and useful influence on the colored population.—With the exception of two or three counties in the state, coloured men were permitted, without question, to give their suffrages for state and town officers. Their deportment was gradually and silently overcoming the prejudices against them; a few more years and the privilege of voting would have been tacitly conceded to them. He spoke of their deportment, because he conceived that on this point injustice had been done to the race, by friends and foes. He said that although he had never served in an office of profit, he had served in his county, in nearly all those which are called offices of honor; that as inspector of the prison, and guardian of the poor, he had possessed opportunities of knowing the condition of the coloured population. From the very few who asked pauper relief, he judged they were provident and industrious. In the prison they were numerous, their offences seldom of a high grade, generally those incident to poverty. The number of commitments was in a great measure to be accounted for from prejudice against the color, and from want of friends. Our Pennsylvania system of "squires" looks less to the satisfaction of justice, than to the satisfaction of the justice's pocket—obedience to the laws is starvation to the magistrate—his interest is made to consist in having the laws broken, or in committing men under colour of law. He will discharge a white man from prison because a few dollars can be raised among his friends; the colored man, for want of funds, remains in prison until term time.

He said he had never known an instance of a colored person using disrespectful language to a white man, when spoken to in the manner

which a gentleman ought to speak. He believed that the conduct of the colored people had been as good as any person had a right to expect, considering the circumstances under which they were placed.

Modern abolitionism has, however, broken in upon this state of things. It has held out expectations to the colored people which cannot be realized—it has led their young men to a course which has produced reaction—it has revived a prejudice which had been slumbering—it has given to the wanton and unthinking an excuse for persecution—it has brought on your tables memorials to prohibit colored people from voting at elections—it has induced the convention for amending the constitution to agitate the question of their right of suffrage.

In the slave states, it has interfered with the comfort and independence of the free colored man; measures of police and restraint have been adopted toward him which would otherwise never have been thought of, making him the object of suspicion, and a slave in every thing but the name. It has made the condition of the slave worse; self-protection induces the owner to make the chain more galling.

Modern abolitionism has produced these effects—it has been humane in the abstract, but dreadfully cruel in the reality.

What will be the consequences if the crusade against the institutions of the south is continued?

If it be carried so far as to induce the people of the south to have well grounded fears of insurrection, they will drive from their state all the free colored people. These people will have to leave their homes which were once peaceful and happy, to find refuge among strangers, with whose manners, customs and modes of living they are unacquainted. To gain subsistance they must enter into competition with the colored people who now reside among us; this competition will reduce the price of wages in all the employments in which colored people engage in our state. The thousands and tens of thousands who will emigrate will be willing to work for the smallest pittance, and the competition will compel our colored people to the same reduction. It is easy to determine that such a state of things will be injurious to the interests of the race: their compensation for employment is already sufficiently low.

How will the whites be affected? Colored labor will come in competition with white labor. It is well known that in our large cities wages are so low as to compel the laboring man to restrict his expenses to the necessaries of life. The nominal rate of wages may appear high, but the expenses of living are high in proportion. The efforts of the intelligent and the benevolent have been directed to the subject of wages, to ascertain what mode can be devised to better the condition of the working

portion of the community. These efforts have not produced the desired effect. Bring in from the slave states the free colored artisans and laborers, and the sudden increase of hands will at once reduce the wages of the whites to the point of mere subsistence. The journeyman now who has a wife and children, finds that it requires all his industry and economy with that of his family, decently to get along, what will it be with the additional competition?

This competition has already been felt to some extent in our large cities. Twenty years ago the poor man had no hesitation in placing his daughter in a respectable family as a servant; she had befor e her the influence of good example—was treated with kindness and respect; her habits of industry and principles of virtue qualified her to be a respectable and valuable wife to the young mechanic. The fashion became general to have colored servants. They could be obtained at lower wages, and the white girl, who had respect for herself, could not put herself on an equality with colored servants: few places were left where white girls could be employed. Unable to get employment as servants, the needle is the next resort; so many are thrown on that means of subsistence that prices are reduced; even here colored females, to a limited extent, enter into competition. The subject of female wages has for a few years past engaged the attention of the benevolent. The prices are so reduced that a woman must have constant work, enjoy uninterrupted health, and work fourteen hours of the day to make a bare subsistence. Increase the competition by the importation of free colored persons from the south, and the result will be heart rending. The dreadful alternative of prostitution or starvation will be left for the white female. The price of wages and poverty have already contributed too much to this vice. Permit a greater reduction of wages, and what will be the prospect of the laboring man?—His own industry, crippled by colored competition, he will look on every child, not as a blessing, but as an additional curse; he will see ahead no prospect of bettering his condition; he will look on his infant daughter, and, instead of indulging the anticipation of seeing her the virtuous wife of a worthy husband, must look upon her innocent face and feel that her home must be the brothel. Hell, with all its horrors, could scarcely be more appalling to a parent's heart. These may be the results of the crusade against the institutions of the south.

If the exertions of the anti-slavery men should succeed in severing the union of the states, would they succeed in abolishing slavery? No!—Slavery would be perpetuated in the south. Those sovereignties would no longer be annoyed by the missionaries and missiles of abolitionism; the men who would venture to generate a spark of incendiarism would be

hanged according to law; and in every spot where slavery existed slavery would be eternal. Such would be the effect of visionoary philanthropy.

He said that in case of the disunion of the states, slavery might, in the opinion of some, be abolished by servile war, resulting in the extermination of the slave-holders. This opinion, if entitled to be called so, was not founded on a knowledge of human nature. Notwithstanding the efforts of missionaries, and the quantities of tracts, the people of the south yet slept quietly in their beds; they had no fear of insurrection—the owners were respected and often beloved by their slaves. He doubted whether the safety of the whites had yet required them, in all the slave-holding states, to employ as many policemen and watchmen as were employed either in New York or our own non-slave holding state. In the absence of slaves we have to resort to bolts and bars, and organized bands of police, to guard our persons and property in the large cities.

He did not believe that any general insurrection of slaves could be formed; he did not believe that, if formed, it could be successful. But admit that it could, he would ask, would such a result be called for on the score of *humanity?* If there lives the wretch who could anticipate with joy the extermination of the noble and intelligent population of the south, by the murderous hands of the infuriated and ignorant slave, he would look upon him as one unworthy the name of man.

He had heard much talk about liberty and freedom. As caballistic words they might answer the purpose of some. He did not believe that man was free merely on account of being clear of personal servitude.—The history of liberty occupies but a few pages of the annals of the human race: it is a small volume comprising thousands of centuries.—Constitutional freedom is of slow growth, and is enjoyed by comparatively few, even in the nations where it is recognized. In the feudal ages the vast majority of men were slaves to a meagre minority, and submitted to a bondage more galling and oppressive than the worst which has been portrayed of the domestic slavery of our day. Fortuitous circumstances from time to time rusted the shackles until a portion of men in a few countries obtained political liberty. The masters and the slaves were of the same color, and this enabled the bondsman to merge into the character of the freeman. Had they been of different colors, they might have changed positions, but one or the other color would have remained slaves.

In Europe the colored man is looked upon without prejudice, because in Europe there are no colored slaves. In this country the fact of the slaves being colored will always prevent them from merging into the character of freemen. The white man may treat the colored with kindness, but he will not admit him to an equality—he will not receive him,

no matter how great his abilities, how correct his morals, into his family, as a husband to his sister or daughter. The laws and the statute book may draw no line of distinction between the white and the colored, but he irresistible law of public opinion, and in this instance, the unconquerable dictates of prejudice do make, and will continue, an impassable gulph between the races. You may extend to the colored man the right of suffrage and the elegibility to office—you may give him the name of freeman—but you cannot confer the reality.

The process of generation may produce mulattoes, tercerons and quarterons, and thus whiten the subjects in color, feature and bony structure; but this will occur in very few cases, for, as Dr. Franklin correctly observes in his remarks on the improvement of the human species, no legislation of procreation will be submitted to. Whilst the color of the master and bondsman are inconvertible, there can be no virtual equality.

He said, that whatever might be the opinion respecting slavery, the constitution which we are bound to support makes it imperative upon us to recognize and sustain the rights of the states, to the letter and spirit of the compact. That constitution was the wonder and admiration of the world. For more than half a century, it had proclaimed that man was capable of self-government: it had secured happiness and safety to our people. It was too precious to be put in jeopardy by abstract notions or chimerical benevolence. Let it be annulled, and freedom will have found its tomb. What people could be found so rash as to attempt an experiment which had failed in the hands of the Americans, surrounded with every favorable circumstance. He would not attempt to show the consequences of disunion; they had been portrayed by abler hands, by the sages of the revolution. They considered union and liberty as one and indivisible; they had the best right to know. And are we to pause between considerations of such importance and personal and political consequences to ourselves? He trusted there was no senator who was not prepared to make the sacrifice if it were necessary. He did not believe, however, that the people were false to themselves, or blinded to their own true interests: he did not believe that for experiments against the institutions of the sovereign states of the south, under the color of philanthropy, they would permit the union to be jeopardized.

He had expressed his opinions without disguise, without fear: the people might judge of them. He had discharged his duty, and the consciousness of having done so was of more importance to him than all the personal consequences which party rancour or fanaticism might inflict.

MR. SPEAKER BURDEN'S

VALEDICTORY ADDRESS,

TO THE SENATE OF PENNSYLVANIA.

Senators.—With no ordinary feelings, I announce, that I now occupy this chair for the last time. I return to you the trust with which you have honored me. I have endeavored to prove my greatful sense of so distinguished a testimonial of your confidence and esteem, by a firm and faithful discharge of my duties.

Thirteen years have elapsed since my election to the legislature, ten of which have been passed in the Senate. Since that time, the annual changes have swept away those by whom I was then surrounded. The throng is still here, but those who then composed it, have passed away. Of those who wrestled in the legislative conflicts of the time, *I alone*, (sustained and cheered by a generous constituency,) remain in the arena. In the lapse which have intervened, Pennsylvania has changed in every thing, but her name, her soil, and her noble people. The last ten years of her history are the most important in her annals,—pregnant in bloodless, but eternal triumphs. Her spirit has burst through every impediment, and assumed its native and gigantic proportions.

Our penal system was an extended and extending process of demoralization. Our jails and prisons, the crowded *primary* schools and colleges of crime. Morality frowned at its impurities, and humanity wept over its cruelties. *Now* our system of punishment is almost perfect. It deters without cruelty—reforms without torture. The most enlightened nations of Europe look upon it as a model. *Then* Education was a neglected interest. The sun of science had no ray for the poor. The

power of the people, like the strength of Sampson, was united to blindness, and threatened to pull down the pillars of the temple which protected them. The torch of education, lit here and there by private hands, glimmered over the state by a feeble and uncertain light. *Now* it is lighted by the hand of government, it cheers every hamlet, and lights every hill side and valley with its blaze.

Then the state was comparatively feeble in its pecuniary resources; with a timid and cantracted system of finance, unable and *afraid* to accomplish any great design. *Now* there is nothing too stupendous for PENNSYLVANIA *enterprise*—nothing too arduous for PENNSYLVANIA energy. To accomplish the most gigantic undertakings, it is sufficient that *she wills it*. By her *wisdom* and *courage* she has secured a currency which Europe respects. Of all the states, she *alone* has a currency worthy the name—a credit unrivalled at home, unchallenged abroad.—By her determined policy pursued in the face of *ignorant* and *partizan* opposition, she has placed her credit on a basis which no storm can shake. She has opened the avenues for foreign wealth to increase her affluence, and reward her wisdom and enterprise.

At that time the extremities of the state were strangers to each other. A journey from one section to the other was a toilsome pilgrimage. Our inland commerce struggled with the embarrassments of a tedious transportation, and the solitude of the wilderness was scarcely disturbed by the heavy wain, laboring wearily over the mountains. *Now* the solitude is peopled, the silence broken with the sounds of trade. Time has conquered space. The barriers of nature are surmounted; our people mingle "like kindred drops in one." Our inland commerce has, as with a start, burst into greatness. Our lines of improvement are even now a proud wonder; yet is the Herculean system in its cradled infancy. Before long, every gorge in our mountains will echo with the pantings of the locomotive, every valley be threaded with canal.

Then Pennsylvania hardly knew her mineral wealth. The state, by incorporating companies, not to *compete with*, but to *aid* individual enterprise, has developed the resources which lie beneath the soil. These now support our manufactures, sustain our marine, create a home market for the farmer, employ our public improvements, sprinkle our state with towns, and swell our towns into cities.

How have these results been attained? The spirit which animated the lifeless resources of Pennsylvania—which *brightened*, *enriched*, and *gladdened*, and *glorified* her, was *legislation—bold*, *enlightened* and *enterprising* LEGISLATION. Had we left her energies to accidental development—had we *wavered*—had we *faltered*—had we *feared*—Pennsyl-

vania would now be where she then was, without credit, power, or improvement. To *wise* and *fearless* legislation, she owes much of her wealth, character and prosperity—her *proud past*—her still *prouder future.* I will carry with me to the grave the priceless satisfaction which I feel, from the consciousness that my humble but steady and ardent exertions, have contributed in some degree, to the efforts which have achieved these results. I will, when I look upon the noble fabric which has been thus reared, feel a warmer throb at my heart at the exulting thought, that from the corner to the cap, there is not a stone in the edifice that I have not aided in placing there.

In the period to which I have referred, Pennsylvania has, in all the political convulsions which have agitated our common country, been calm, patriotic and resolved—opposed to influences, whether centrifugal or otherwise, which have disturbed the spheres of the states, or menaced the harmony of the system. She has sustained the rights of the states against every encroachment, and supported the Union as the indissoluble seal and cement of freedom, happiness and national existence. She has proved herself to be the pendulum of our political machine—the Keystone of the Arch. In the tempests of party which have agitated the Union, the State of Pennsylvania has *looked to her Senate* as the stay sail of the storm, in which were hope, security and haven.

The senate whilst it has respected public opinion has turned a deaf ear on popular *clamor;*—whilst it has consulted and obeyed the *wishes* of the *people* has disregarded the dictates of *party.* It has subserved the interests of the *state*—not the interests of *faction*;—and has recognized *patriotism* and not *party* as its governing principle. With such motives and rules of action, though it may at times have incurred *partial* and *passing* reproach, it has eventually promoted the interest and secured the admiration of the people. *Time* and *reflection* have corrected *prejudice*, and turned censure *and* opposition into approval and gratitude. To the journals of such a body, I will be contented to point as a chart of my public life. I have never avoided a vote nor hesitated to avow an opinion. My suffrage has never been recorded against a measure of improvement, or education, or the means to effect them—nor has my voice been silent when the cause of political and religious freedom required my support. I have ever avowed and sustained the conciliatory and compromising legislation, which unites the interests of each section for the welfare of all. I have never dreaded expenditure or debt, for investments in improvement or education—for measures to give comfort to the poor and the pensioner, or instruction to the ignorant, or in any way to elevate the character and illustrate the history of my native state.

During my twelve years service in the Legislature, my constituents have never sent instructions, nor required pledges. Their suffrages have always expressed satisfaction for the *past*, and confidence for the *future*.—*Not their wishes*, but my own, induce me to retire from public life. Few representatives have had more devoted constituents. May I also add, *no constituents* have had a representative more anxious to promote their welfare, or more truly grateful for their uniform and generous support! I have been four times elected to the Speaker's chair of the senate. To all attacks on my course as a public servant, I will point with confidence to that station as a silent and irrefutable answer. To *those*, whose *worth* has won my respect—whose *kindness* has secured my *esteem*—To *those with* whom I have so *long* been linked, by friendly and affectionate intercourse, it now becomes my duty to utter the heavy word, FAREWELL—the *heavier*, as it may (and in reference to many no doubt will) separate us forever. A large portion of my life has been spent here, *This* has been the scene of my exertions, the place of my pride; and in bidding *adieu*, is it *strange* that I should feel, with a *deep* and *earnest* sensibility, that this Hall has been to me as *a home*, this *circle of Senators* as a *band of brothers?* With feelings of personal regard for one and all—with anxious wishes for your welfare, I bid you FAREWELL.